

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claim 1 will have been amended to clarify the features of the invention. In view of the amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections set forth in the Official Action, together with the allowance of all the claims pending in the present application.

In the outstanding Official Action, claims 1 - 4, 6, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FENG in view of NAHABOO et al. Claims 5, 8, 10, 13, 16, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over FENG in view of NAHABOO et al. in further view of ABELOW. Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 is now limited to interfaces for customer service representatives. In contrast, FENG pertains to creating browsers for general users browsing the Internet and multimedia applications. There is no discussion or suggestion of creating an interface specifically for customer service representatives. NAHABOO et al. does not supply the deficiency of FENG.

Thus, it is believed that the rejection is traversed and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Claim 3 recites validating targeted users behaviors and user preferences of the model. Such a feature is not taught or suggested by the applied references.

In addition, claims 3 and 11 recite tracking design requirements for the validated user behaviors and user preferences. As a result of such a limitation, it is ensured that the user interface design is producing the desired results, e.g., improved customer satisfaction. Such a feature is not taught or suggested by the applied references.

Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claim 3 is traversed and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 3.

Claim 11 recites documenting and validating pre-determined targeted behaviors and preferences of the model. The rejection does not address the “documenting” limitation. Moreover, validating is not believed to be shown by the applied references.

Claim 11 also recites integrating user-customization into a design . . . Such a feature allows a user to select his interface style. For example, if the system does not recall the user’s style (e.g., when returning from a vacation) or the user is a new employee and does not yet have a defined style, the integrating feature applies.

Thus, it is believed that the rejection of claim 11 is traversed and it is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 11.

Accordingly, for all the reasons noted above, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of each of the outstanding rejections of claims 1, 3 and 11. Applicants additionally submit that each of claims 2, 4 - 10, and 12 - 18 are allowable, at least because each depends, directly or indirectly, from an allowable independent claim, as well as for reasons related to their own recitations.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an indication to that effect. Applicants have amended the claims to clarify the features of the present invention. Applicants have discussed the features recited in applicants' claims and have shown how these features are not taught, disclosed, nor rendered obvious by the reference applied by the Examiner.

Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,  
Robert R. BUSHEY et al.

Reg. No. 40,003



\_\_\_\_\_  
Bruce H. Bernstein  
Reg. No. 29,027

July 26, 2005  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1950 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, Virginia 20191  
(703) 716-1191

Alan M. Lenkin  
Reg. #40063